```
I826ketp
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                              17 CR 243(SHS)
                 V.
5
     ARASH KETABCHI,
6
                     Defendant.
 7
           -----x
 8
                                               New York, N.Y.
                                               August 2, 2018
9
                                               3:00 p.m.
10
      Before:
11
                           HON. SIDNEY H. STEIN,
12
                                               District Judge
13
14
                                APPEARANCES
15
     GEOFFREY S. BERMAN
           United States Attorney for the
16
           Southern District of New York
     ROBERT B. SOBELMAN
17
           Assistant United States Attorney
     GARY G. BECKER, ESQ.
18
           Attorney for Defendant
19
     Also present:
      Special Agent Evan Picariello, Dept. Homeland Security
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1 (In open court; case called) THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your names 2 3 for the record. 4 MR. SOBELMAN: Robert Sobelman for the United States. 5 I am joined at counsel table by Special Agent Evan Picariello 6 of Homeland Security Investigations. 7 Good afternoon, your Honor. 8 THE COURT: Good afternoon, gentlemen. 9 MR. BECKER: Good afternoon, your Honor. I am Gary 10 Becker. With me here today is Arash Ketabchi, standing next to 11 me. 12 THE COURT: Please be seated in the courtroom. 13 Do you have an application, Mr. Becker? 14 MR. BECKER: Yes, your Honor. My application is to 15 permit Mr. Ketabchi to withdraw his previously entered plea of not guilty and to make a plea of guilty to Count One of the 16 indictment. 17 18 THE COURT: Is the plea agreement that I have on my 19 desk, and apparently executed, identical to the agreement that 20 was sent to my chambers? 21 MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Swear the defendant in, please. 23 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please stand and raise your right 24 hand. 25

(Defendant sworn)

1	THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please state your full name and
2	spell your name for the record.
3	JUROR: Arash Ketabchi. A-r-a-s-h. Last name is
4	K-e-t-a-b-c-h-i.
5	THE COURT: Just a moment.
6	(Pause)
7	THE COURT: Mr. Ketabchi, do you understand, sir, that
8	you are now under oath and if you answer any of my questions
9	falsely, your false or untrue answers may later be used against
10	you in another prosecution for perjury or for making a false
11	statement?
12	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: How old are you, sir?
14	THE DEFENDANT: 44.
15	THE COURT: How far did you get in school?
16	THE DEFENDANT: I graduated high school, 12th grade.
17	THE COURT: Are you able to read, write speak, and
18	understand English?
19	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Is English your native language, sir?
21	THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
22	THE COURT: When you did you start learning English?
23	THE DEFENDANT: I believe it was around five years
24	old.
25	THE COURT: I take it you are fluent in reading,

```
speaking and understanding English?
1
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: Do you want an interpreter here for any
 4
      reason?
 5
               THE DEFENDANT: I don't, your Honor.
 6
               THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been
 7
      under the care of a doctor or a psychiatrist?
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 8
9
               THE COURT: What is that?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: I see a psychiatrist and also a
11
      therapist.
12
               THE COURT: For reasons related to this indictment
13
      against you?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: No, prior to. I have been mental
      illness for years now.
15
16
               THE COURT: Is there a diagnosis?
17
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
               THE COURT: What is that?
18
19
               THE DEFENDANT: Bipolar, depression, and manic
20
      depression.
21
               THE COURT: Thank you.
22
               Have you ever been treated or hospitalized for any
23
     mental illness, or any type of addiction including drug or
24
      alcohol addiction. Exclude the treatment by therapists for the
25
      diagnoses you just talked about as long as they are not
```

```
I826ketp
1
      inpatient.
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, multiple times I
 3
      have.
 4
               THE COURT: For the diagnoses you have just told me
 5
      about or others?
 6
               THE DEFENDANT: Others. I have been in psyche wards a
 7
      couple times and I have had multiple inpatient drug and rehab
      facilities.
8
9
               THE COURT: What drugs are you taking now -- drugs,
10
     medicines or pills are you taking now, sir?
11
               THE DEFENDANT: I am taking prescription drugs.
12
      taking Topamax every morning with 50 milligrams. I am taking
13
      100 or 200 milligrams -- I can't remember -- of Lamictal. And
      5 milligrams of Zyprexa every evening. That's three total
14
15
     drugs.
16
               THE COURT: Have you taken those three drugs in the
17
     past 24 hours?
18
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: Any others?
20
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: Have you had any alcoholic beverage in the
22
      last 24 hours?
23
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
```

cognition, that is, your ability to think or to understand me

THE COURT: Do those drugs in any way affect your

24

25

```
1
      or anyone else or to express yourself?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: Is your mind clear right now?
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Are you feeling all right?
               THE DEFENDANT: I feel good. A little nervous, but
 6
 7
      you know.
               THE COURT: That's understandable.
 8
9
               I take it you believe you have clarity of thought.
10
      That is my concern.
11
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I am fine with that.
12
               THE COURT:
                          Do you have an attorney here today?
13
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes. To my right.
14
               THE COURT: Who is that?
               THE DEFENDANT: Mr. Becker.
15
16
               THE COURT: Mr. Becker, do you have any doubt as to
17
     Mr. Ketabchi's competence to plead at this time especially
18
      given his comments about multiple inpatient treatment?
19
               MR. BECKER: No, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Mr. Ketabchi, you've heard Mr. Becker tell
21
     me that you wanted to enter a plea of guilty to Count One of
22
      the information against you. Is that true? Do you wish to
23
     plead quilty?
24
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: Have you had a full opportunity to discuss
```

your case with Mr. Becker and to discuss the consequences of entering a plea of guilty?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Are you satisfied with Mr. Becker and his representation of you?

THE DEFENDANT: Very satisfied.

THE COURT: On the basis of Mr. Ketabchi's responses to my questions and my observations of his demeanor as he stands here before me today and on prior occasions in this litigation, I make the finding that he is fully competent to enter an informed plea at this time.

Before I accept a plea from you, sir, I am going to ask you certain questions. My questions are intended to satisfy me that you wish to plead guilty because you are in fact guilty of the crime to which you want to enter a plea of guilty and that you fully understand the consequences of entering a plea of guilty. I am going to be describing to you certain rights you have under the Constitution and laws of the United States.

You are going to be giving up those rights, every one of them, if you enter a plea of guilty today. I want you to listen to me carefully and if you don't understand anything I am saying to you or anything I am asking you, I want you to stop me. You can ask me anything you want. You can ask Mr. Becker anything you want. My concern is to make certain that

you understand what I am asking you and that you understand what I am saying to you.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Under the Constitution and laws of the United States, Mr. Ketabchi, you have a right to speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges against you, which are contained in Indictment 17 CR 243.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would presumed innocent and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt.

You would not have to prove you were innocent at trial.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, a jury of composed of 12 people selected from this district would have to agree unanimously that you were guilty.

Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You also have a right to be represented by an attorney at a trial and at every other stage of the proceedings against you. And if you cannot afford an attorney, an attorney is going to be given to you at no charge to you.

You will not have to pay for that attorney's services.

Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, sir, you would have the right to see and hear all of the witnesses against you. You would have of the right to have your attorney cross-examine those witnesses. You also will have the right to have your attorney object to any of the government's evidence, and you would have the right to have your attorney offer evidence on your own behalf if you so desired, and you also would have the right to have subpoenas issued or other compulsory process used to compel witnesses to testify in your defense.

Do you understand all those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the right to testify if you wanted to but, Mr. Ketabchi, nobody could force you to testify if you did not want to testify. The decision of whether or not to testify would be entirely yours.

In addition, if you decided not to testify at your trial, the jury would be instructed that they could draw no inference or suggestion of guilt from the fact that you decided not to testify.

Do you understand all those rights, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that by entering a plea

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

of guilty today, you are giving up each and every one of your rights I described, you are waiving those rights, and you will have no trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that you have the ability to change your mind right now, Mr. Ketabchi, and you can refuse to enter this plea of guilty? You don't have to enter it if you do not want to for any reason. You can change your mind right now and decide you don't want to plead guilty.

Do you understand those rights?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you received a copy of Indictment 17 CR 243?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. It is here in front of me.

THE COURT: Did you read it?

THE DEFENDANT: I did.

THE COURT: Did you discuss it with Mr. Becker?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: You have the right to have me read that indictment to you in open court. Similarly, if you don't want me to read it, I won't.

What is your pleasure, sir?

THE DEFENDANT: I am okay. Mr. Becker went over it. I don't need you to read it.

25

THE COURT: I accept that as a knowing and voluntarily 1 2 waiver of the right to have the indictment read in open court. 3 Do you understand that you are charged in Count One 4 with participating in a conspiracy to commit wire fraud in 5 violation of 18, U.S.C, 1349? 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 MR. BECKER: Your Honor, I believe it is 1343. THE COURT: All right. Let's see. 8 9 Government, what is the government's position? 10 MR. SOBELMAN: Your Honor, 1349 is the conspiracy 11 statute. Your Honor is correct. MR. BECKER: Your Honor, forgive me. I was referring 12 13 to the substantive. Forgive me. 14 THE COURT: No, it's the conspiracy. Just to be 15 certain, I am going to take a look. MR. SOBELMAN: To clarify 1343 is the object of the 16 17 conspiracy, which is referenced in the indictment. 18 MR. BECKER: Your Honor, I stand corrected. 19 THE COURT: That's all right. 20 Yes, 1349 is the conspiracy. Any person who attempts 21 to conspire to commit any offense under this chapter, shall be 22 subject to the same penalties as those prescribed in the 23 offense, the commission of which was the object of the 24 conspiracy. 1343 is the substantive crime of wire fraud.

So let me go back. Do you understand that Count One

of Indictment 17 CR 243, sir, charges you with conspiring to commit wire fraud in violation of 18, United States Code, Section 1349?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you did not plead guilty, the government would have to prove each and every element of the charge in Count One beyond a reasonable doubt at a trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Sobelman, please, inform Mr. Ketabchi of the elements of the charge?

MR. SOBELMAN: The charge has two elements: First, that two or more persons in some way or manner agreed to try to accomplish a common and unlawful plan to commit wire fraud; two, the defendant knew the unlawful purpose of the plan and willfully joined in it.

The substantive crime of wire fraud, which was the object of the conspiracy has three elements. First, that the defendant devised a scheme to defraud or to obtain money or property by materially false or fraudulent pretenses, representations, or promises or willfully participated in such a scheme with knowledge of its fraudulent nature; two, the defendant acted with intent to defraud; and three, in advancing, furthering or carrying out the scheme, the defendant transmitted any writing, signal or sound by means of a wire,

radio or television communication in interstate commerce or caused the transmission of any writing, signal or sound of some kind by means of a wire, radio or television communication in interstate commerce.

THE COURT: Mr. Ketabchi, do you understand those are the elements the government would have it prove beyond a reasonable doubt before a jury could return a verdict of guilty against you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In addition to what Mr. Sobelman mentioned, the government is required to prove that venue lies in the Southern District of New York, which is a fancy way of saying at least one act of the conspiracy took place in the Southern District of New York.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The burden is on the government to prove at least one act in connection with the conspiracy took place in the Southern District of New York. It is not prove beyond a reasonable doubt. It is simply proof by a evidence.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the maximum possible penalty of conspiring to commit wire fraud is 20 years' imprisonment, three years' supervised release, a fine of

the greatest of \$250,000 or twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to individuals other than you resulting from the offense, plus a \$100 mandatory special assessment; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, I mentioned that part of the maximum term was the term supervised release. Supervised release, sir, means you will be subject to monitoring by the Probation Department upon your release from prison. That monitoring will be under certain terms and conditions, which if you violate them could lead to your reimprisonment without a jury trial for all or part of the term of supervised release and even without credit for any time you may have already served on postrelease supervision.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I also have the authority to order restitution to anyone injured as a result of your criminal conduct.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand if I accept your guilty plea, sir, and determine that you are guilty of conspiring to commit wire fraud that determination may deprive you of such valuable civil rights such as the right to vote,

the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury, and the right to possess any kind of firearm?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Becker, is your client a United States citizen?

MR. BECKER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Ketabchi, under current law there are sentencing guidelines that judges have to apply to determine what a fair and reasonable sentence is for each defendant who comes before that judge.

Have you talked to Mr. Becker about the guidelines?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that I won't be able to determine what sentence is appropriate here until I first determine what the proper guideline range is; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: To help me determine that, I am going to receive a report from the Probation Office. You'll have an opportunity to be interviewed by them. Mr. Becker will have the ability to be there. I want you to give them complete and accurate information because I am going to use that report in determining what your sentence is.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You'll have an opportunity as will Mr. Becker and Mr. Sobelman to object to any findings of fact in that report. If there are any objections, I will adjudicate them.

I am going to use that report in determining what the appropriate guideline range is. Even after I determine what the appropriate guideline range is, I then have to determine whether a departure is available and should be employed by me. If I do that, then you can be sentenced on the basis of a departure from the guideline either above the guideline range or below the guideline range.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Even after I do that, I then under the current procedures set forth by the Supreme Court need to apply all of the factors in 18, United States Code, Section 3553(a) to determine what is an appropriate sentence here.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you are sentenced to prison, and at this point based on what I know of this trial, you will be sentenced to prison, but I will keep an open mind.

Parole has been abolished, sir, and you will not be released any earlier on parole. You will serve your term of

sentence without being released earlier on parole.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if Mr. Becker or Mr. Sobelman has told you anything different about what your sentence or estimated what it is likely to be or in fact told you what they think it is going to be or even if you yourself have a belief as to what your sentence is going to be, everybody could be wrong; do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: That because I am going to sentence you and I don't know what your sentence is going to be. I need to receive the information from the Probation Department. I need to listen to what Mr. Becker wants to submit to me. The victims have a right to submit information to me as well and the government has a right to submit information. I need all of that information before I can determine what I am going sentence you to.

If I do sentence you to something that you don't expect or that is different from what people have told you it is going to be, you still are going to be bound to your guilty plea, sir. You will not be allowed to withdraw it.

Do you understand?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, I have a document here and it is

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

dated July 27th. It is six pages with exhibits. It is addressed to Mr. Becker. It looks like it is signed by Mr. Sobelman on behalf of the government.

I am going ask my deputy to mark it as Court Exhibit

1. I will ask her to show you the last page.

Is that your signature on the last page?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you read that agreement before you signed it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you discuss it with Mr. Becker?

Did you discuss the plea agreement with Mr. Becker?

THE DEFENDANT: Oh, yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Did you understand it when you signed it?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand it now?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does this letter agreement -- I will refer to it as a letter agreement -- the plea agreement, Government Exhibit No. 1, constitute your complete and total understanding of the entire agreement between yourself and the government and your attorney?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Is everything about your plea and sentence contained in this agreement? In other words, are there any

```
side deals I should know about?
1
 2
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               No, your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: Has anyone offered you any inducements or
 4
      threatened you or forced you to plead guilty to enter into the
 5
     plea agreement?
6
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: Do you understand, sir, that in this
8
      agreement you have agreed to waive your right to appeal the
9
      sentence and you have agreed to waive your right to
10
      collaterally attack the sentence if I sentence you to 87
11
     months' imprisonment or less?
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
12
13
               THE COURT: Do you understand that in this agreement
14
      you have agreed to the entry of the consent order of
      forfeiture?
15
16
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
17
               THE COURT: Do you understand that in this consent
18
      order of forfeiture, you've consented to a money judgment
19
      against you in the amount of $1,059,803.84?
20
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: Do you understand that you have also
22
      agreed in this plea agreement to make restitution in the amount
23
      of $563,427.99?
24
               THE DEFENDANT:
                              Yes, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: Do you also understand you have agreed not
```

21

22

23

24

25

1 to appeal any term of supervised release, that is, to the three 2 years or less? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: You've agreed not to appeal any fine that 4 is less than or equal to \$250,000? 5 6 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: And that you have agreed not to appeal any forfeiture amount that is less than or equal to \$1,059,803.84? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: You've agreed not to appeal any forfeiture 11 amount that is greater than or equal to that same sum? 12 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: You've agreed not to appeal any restitution amount that is less than or equal to \$563,427.99. 14 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 16 MR. BECKER: Your Honor, forgive me for jumping in. 17 may have misheard the Court; but I thought I heard the Court 18 ask Mr. Ketabchi whether he agreed that he was waiving any 19 right to appeal an order of forfeiture in excess of the 20 \$1,059,083.84.

If I heard the Court correctly, I am not sure that is correct.

THE COURT: Just a moment.

I think I may have read the government's obligation. Let me correct that. Let's make sure. Thank you, sir. As I

25

1	was saying it, it didn't ring true. So let me restate it.
2	You understand, sir, that you've agreed not to appeal
3	any fine as long as I impose a fine on you that is \$250,000 or
4	less?
5	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
6	THE COURT: And that you've agreed not to appeal any
7	forfeiture that I impose on you, that is, the sum \$1,059,803.84
8	or less?
9	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
10	THE COURT: You've agreed not to appeal any
11	restitution amount that I impose on you that is \$563,427.99 or
12	less?
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Mr. Becker, I think that clears it up.
15	MR. BECKER: Absolutely.
16	THE COURT: Government?
17	MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor. That's correct.
18	THE COURT: Do you understand also in this agreement
19	that you are waiving your right to assert the statute of
20	limitations as a defense to the indictment against you?
21	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
22	THE COURT: Mr. Becker, are you aware of any valid
23	defense that would prevail at trial or know of any reason why
24	Mr. Ketabchi should not be permitted to plead guilty?
٥٦	MD DECKED N

MR. BECKER: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Sir, is there an adequate factual basis in your view to support your client's plea?

MR. BECKER: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Sobelman, in the view of the government is there an adequate factual basis to support Mr. Ketabchi's plea?

MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Ketabchi, tell me what you did that makes you guilty of conspiring to commit wire fraud?

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, during some of the time period charged in the indictment, I agreed with others to engage in conduct that was fraud on members of the public through telemarketing businesses.

In 2014 I went to work as a salesmen for a telemarketing company selling business development products and services. The company was owned by William Sinclair and Mike Finocchiaro and was called Olive Branch Marketing.

THE COURT: Speak louder.

Olive--

THE DEFENDANT: Olive Branch Marketing.

We offered for sale the setting up of limited liability companies, marketing website design, business plans, and other services to persons interested in operating a business from their home. The persons we called had in most cases previously bought similar services from other

telemarketing companies.

To induce customers to buy our services, we led them to believe that once their new businesses were set up, they stood to generate substantial income with little effort on their part. Although the sales pitch often included words like "there is the potential for this income," we also crossed the line and falsely told the customers that their businesses would in fact generate this income.

Your Honor, I knew what I was doing was wrong and unlawful.

THE COURT: When you talk about 2014 and you refer to the time period in the indictment, were you doing this activity between 2013 and 2017, sir?

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, may I have one moment to consult with Mr. Ketabchi?

THE COURT: Yes.

(Pause)

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I don't remember the exact time frame; but I know it is not limited to 2014. It expanded through other time frames as well.

THE COURT: When you were talking to me, you referred to lists that you purchased -- sorry. You did not refer to lists that you purchased.

You referred to the fact that the people you were calling had previously bought similar things; is that right?

1	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
2	THE COURT: I take it you got those names from the
3	lists that you purchased from other telemarketers?
4	THE DEFENDANT: The other companies had sold these
5	client's products and then they would send the leads what we
6	call in the industry onto us and then we would sell the clients
7	other services or something similar as well.
8	THE COURT: You gave money in exchange for those
9	leads; right?
10	THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Not direct money. It was called
11	a rev share, revenue sharing. So if I sold the client, for
12	example, \$10,000, they would get a percentage, 20 percent,
13	30 percent whatever they
14	THE COURT: In other words, they would share in the
15	revenue that you obtained from sales?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
17	THE COURT: Is it correct that you targeted elderly
18	people?
19	THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Was there a significant percentage of
21	elderly people in the sales that you made?
22	Mr. Becker, if you want to talk to your client, you
23	certainly have the right to do so.
24	Talk to him.
25	MR. BECKER: Thank you.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, we didn't know the age of		
the people and the ages spanned. I have spoken to people who		
were 21 years old, 40 years old, 50 years old. It was a range.		
Where there some elderly people, absolutely.		
THE COURT: You are telling me you did not target in		
any way elderly people?		
THE DEFENDANT: No, not at all. That wasn't that		
wasn't the business of our industry.		
THE COURT: There was no potential for income; isn't		
that correct?		
THE DEFENDANT: Sorry?		
THE COURT: In the businesses that you said you were		
going to set up, there was no potential for income?		
THE DEFENDANT: No, they didn't make any money.		
THE COURT: They never could make any money. The		
businesses were not set up; is that correct?		
THE DEFENDANT: We set up their businesses, sure.		
Everything I sold we had a third-party, which is actually a		
gentleman on the indictment as well.		
THE COURT: Mr. Becker is saying don't talk about		
other people.		
MR. BECKER: No, I am saying he is not on the		
indictment.		
THE DEFENDANT: So the third-party company would		
fulfill every single item we sold.		

THE COURT: The fulfillment center? 1 THE DEFENDANT: Fulfillment center. 2 3 THE COURT: Go ahead. 4 THE DEFENDANT: If you spoke to any of the clients, 5 every client that was sold an LLC got a tax ID number. If they 6 were sold a business plan, they were sold a business plan. 7 have documentation and proof of everything I sold. MR. BECKER: Your Honor, may a -- because the Court's 8 9 questions are very probative and if I could share my 10 understanding, which is not inconsistent --11 THE COURT: Let me finish and then you can say 12 anything you want. 13 MR. BECKER: Sure. 14 THE COURT: Are you aware of any income that was 15 earned by any of the clients you signed up? THE DEFENDANT: When you are selling product called 16 17 Young Living, they did receive some checks from Young Living. 18 It was -- I don't know how to explain what kind of program it 19 was. It was a marketing program where if they would sign up 20 somebody under them, so on and so forth, they would receive 21 income. So we would set them up with a program that was a 22 marketing program and there were some people that did receive 23 actual small checks. 24 THE COURT: Do you have any sense of the percentage of 25 the people who were victims of your fraud who received small

checks?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't remember exactly, but that was -- that happened at Olive Branch Marketing on Mr. Sinclair's floor.

THE COURT: Could you estimate it as less than
5 percent of the target of the victims of the fraud?

THE DEFENDANT: I don't remember exactly, your Honor.

THE COURT: Was it less than 10 percent?

Again, if you know. If you have a range.

THE DEFENDANT: I don't remember. I don't know.

THE COURT: If people wanted their money back from your program, what you were telling your people was to try to avoid giving them their money back; is that correct?

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, forgive me for jumping in -THE COURT: I am trying to understand the contours of
the fraud.

MR. BECKER: Okay. Let me share this with you and then if the Court has additional questions, we'll answer them.

My understanding is that customers who previously purchased similar products and whose names were included on the lead lists that these companies purchased were called up and the sales pitch essentially — this is not in every case — was: Have you ever thought operating a business out of your home? It can be very lucrative. We can set up an LLC for you. We can design a website. We can give you a business plan and

then you can market whatever products you want to market. For example, if you like dogs, you want to sell dog food, you can do that.

There is no question, and that is why Mr. Ketabchi is pleading guilty here today, that in inducing the customers to part with their money, fraud was committed because representations that were false were made about of the income that would be generated. In terms of other representations that were made that were false, the Court may recall an earlier proceeding I implored the Court to understand that the indictment did not contain a very complete list of what the false allegations were. And had this case gone forward, I would have sought a bill of particulars. But there is no question what Mr. Ketabchi told you when he read the allocution that they crossed the line and made false statements about it.

There is also no question, your Honor -- I think I asked the question you asked of Mr. Ketabchi -- there was certainly the potential to make money. You had an LLC. You could market products. There is no question the customers were misled. It was a large-scale fraud. Mr. Ketabchi fully accepts responsibility for his role in it.

In a way, I am glad the Court asked the question it asked, because it is important to understand exactly what the fraud was and what it wasn't.

THE COURT: That's what I am trying to get at.

MR. BECKER: So, for example, someone — the sales pitch is we'll set up an LLC for you and it will cost you X amount of money. The customer, as I understand it, paid that amount of money and an LLC was in fact set up. The customer in fact got a business plan and a website.

Now, it may have been, and I don't dispute this, and believe the government's position is it was a generic website, that they were essentially all the same or incredibly rudimentary and it was really kind of a farce. I believe that would be the government's position.

I think part of the fraud was, and Mr. Ketabchi alluded to this or actually referred to it, that customers were misled into believing that once this stuff was in place, they could sit back and put their legs up on the coffee table and the money would start rolling in. Businesses just don't work that way. That was the fraud, I suppose. Although, the government I don't think has expressly said that.

So that is my understanding of where the fraud was.

My understand is that you are going to get a website, you are going to get an LLC, and it was implicit that you are going to make a lot of money or else why do this. In fact, as

Mr. Ketabchi allocuted, they expressly did cross the line and tell customers that. That was false and that is what made this telemarketing scheme different from, I suppose, so many others where they couch their words more carefully and therefore not

subject to criminal prosecution.

THE COURT: My last question went to a different aspect of this, that is, whether or not they made efforts to prevent people from obtaining their money back when they wanted their money back.

MR. BECKER: I would respectfully ask that the Court permit Mr. Ketabchi to not answer that at this point.

THE COURT: That's fine.

MR. BECKER: Only because it is not something that I feel I have discussed with him sufficiently in this context, and it can certainly be addressed I suppose at sentencing.

THE COURT: That's fine. Let's let it go at that,
Mr. Ketabchi. Thank you.

Before I started asking you some questions, you were reading from a document. That is perfectly permissible and I would assume it is perfectly permissible and maybe even visible, I don't know, that Mr. Becker assisted you with that. All of that is fine. What I do need you to tell me is that everything you read is in fact true?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think you told me this, but I just want to ask and make sure it is on the record that when you did these acts that you told me about, you knew what you were doing was wrong and illegal; is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

1 THE COURT: Mr. Sobelman, what evidence does the 2 government have against Mr. Ketabchi? 3 MR. SOBELMAN: Your Honor, if the case were to proceed 4 to trial, the government's evidence would include, among other 5 things, cooperator testimony including individuals that 6 participated in the fraud of Mr. Ketabchi, including victim 7 testimony, including individuals that Mr. Ketabchi personally defrauded by telephone calls with them. It would include email 8 9 correspondence between Mr. Ketabchi and his coconspirators. 10 would include communications from electronic devices seized from Mr. Ketabchi and others. It would also include financial 11 12 records showing victim money flowing to Mr. Ketabchi's himself 13 and also the corporate entities that he established and others 14 established in furtherance of the fraud. 15 THE COURT: Thank you. Mr. Ketabchi, how do you now plead to the charge in 16 Count One of this indictment, guilty or not guilty? 17 18 THE DEFENDANT: Guilty, your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty because you are 20 quilty, sir? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily and of 23 your own free will? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 25 THE COURT: Because you acknowledge you're guilty as

charged, because I find you know your rights and are waiving them knowingly and voluntarily, because I find your plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily and supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the offense, I accept your guilty plea to Count One, sir, and I determine you to be guilty of that count.

I am going to set the date for sentencing as November 8th of the at  $2:30~\mathrm{p.m.}$ 

I take it, government, there is no motion in regard to bail?

MR. SOBELMAN: That's correct.

THE COURT: Mr. Ketabchi, I am going to continue you on bail on the same conditions that you have been released on previously. In other words, you have to follow all of the conditions of your release.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I will see you on November 8th or any adjourned date.

MR. BECKER: Your Honor, thank you. While I am here, would the following week be available for the Court,

November 8th? I have something that I believe is going to require my presence out of town. I can change it if need be but if the Court --

THE COURT: Of course. Let's take a look.

```
I826ketp
               November 15th. I have a trial at that time so we'll
1
2
      make it 4:30 p.m.
3
               MR. BECKER: Thank you, your Honor.
 4
               THE COURT: November 15 at 4:30 p.m.
5
               Anything else, government?
6
               MR. SOBELMAN: No, your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: Defense?
8
               MR. BECKER: No, your Honor.
9
               THE COURT: Thank you all.
10
                                     000
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```